

HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIII, No. 6

Saturday, February 11, 1956

Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Shadow of Dewey: On February 2, former Governor Thomas E. Dewey paid a visit to President Eisenhower in the White House. When he left he admitted he had talked politics but dismissed as "idle" any speculation that he might be a presidential candidate again if Ike does not run. Later the same day, General Howard M. Snyder, the President's personal physician, told newsmen that the President "should have more time" and that "he is not at a point yet to know whether he can go ahead," referring to the impending decision of the President as to whether or not he should run again.

These two facts and their chronology may have had no actual significance at all. But it is symptomatic of the growing cynicism on Capitol Hill that many GOP members of Congress should interpret these events, as follows: the presidential advisers, notably Dewey, want more time to consolidate their hold on the party and to make ready a successor to Ike if the latter should not run.

Be that as it may. The fact is that the GOP liberals badly lack an adequate candidate, should Ike take himself out of the picture. The roll call is diminishing week by week. Recently, White House circles have shown a tendency to write off such names as Paul Hoffman, Milton Eisenhower and Harold Stassen. There is still private talk as to whether Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren is actually definitely out of the picture — Ike's remarks on the subject seem to leave confusion.

This week, the pro-Warren people feel encouraged by a report from New York that a biography of the Supreme Court Justice is now under consideration for publication by the editors of one of the largest mass magazines in the country.

In any case, fewer are counting on Warren today.

But the real paucity of liberal candidates is best illustrated by the vacillating loyalties of the Dewey crowd in past weeks. Last week, it was

felt here that the crowd had settled its support on Vice President Nixon to succeed Ike. But this week, unaccountably, reports went around town that "little Tom" thought it should be Governor Christian Herter of Massachusetts. Because of Herter's poor health (arthritis) and additionally his doctrinaire insistence on massive foreign aid, politicians can scarcely take this bid as very serious.

All this indecision and divided counsel among the liberals, it is agreed, makes the way more feasible for the nomination campaign of Senator William F. Knowland. The Right wing of the Party could more easily agree on the Californian than could the Left wing on any possible candidate mentioned so far.

Eighty per cent of the White House correspondents felt that the President would not run, after attending his (televised) press conference of February 8. Most observers here are inclined to believe that Ike will give his decision — as he intimated in the press conference — before the end of the month. Some political experts think that a decision by March 1 (if it's negative) will wreck the Palace Guard's plans to throttle open primaries and fasten a Guardist-chosen candidate on the Party and its convention next summer.

Labor and GOP: A poll of labor leaders strengthens the long-held conviction of veteran political observers that the GOP can never outbid the Democrats for the support of these leaders. Secretary of Labor Mitchell and the Palace Guard want the Taft-Hartley law emasculated in an effort to appease labor leaders.

The poll shows labor leaders 9 to 1 against Ike. California Governor Goodwin Knight, who in his addresses has been telling business organizations that the GOP must seek to win "labor support,"

does no better in the poll than Ike, and Chief Justice Warren gets only 17 per cent to Stevenson's 83 per cent.

Labor leaders hope Warren gets the GOP nomination and they believe he would be highly satisfactory to them; but they prefer Stevenson, Harriman or Kefauver who presumably would swing a Democratic majority in Congress. Professionals incline toward the Taft view that the GOP should appeal to the 35 to 40 per cent among union members who vote Republican. Among other reasons, these union members object to the determination of labor leaders to control their thoughts, make pronouncements in their name, and dominate every phase of their lives.

Gas Bill: Two inside views on the hot controversy which ended in a victorious congressional vote for the measure freeing natural gas from federal price regulation:

(1) The charge that natural gas producers sought to bribe a United States Senator for \$2,500 to vote for the bill proved a boomerang. The bill originally was expected to pass by not more than a half dozen votes. That was before the scandal arose. After the uproar, the vote was taken and the bill won by a surprisingly large margin — 53 to 38. Apparently, Senators considered the allegation of scandal a little too synthetic and too artfully timed, and reacted strongly.

(2) But why did the opposition cave in so readily? It is strongly felt by old observers on Capitol Hill that the quick passage depended on some deal made between Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson (who supported the bill) and the bloc of northern Democratic liberals (Lehman, Douglas, *et al*) who opposed it. The latter, if really determined, could have postponed final action by staging a rear-guard running fight on various amendments, perhaps lasting over several weeks. But, it is believed, Johnson must have promised this "liberal" bloc something, perhaps in the public power field, which will be "paid off" in a later legislative phase of this session.

Eisenhower-Eden Talks: The meetings between the President and the British Premier have ended with the score — according to some American sources — no hits, no runs, no errors. No errors?

Others who watched the dull proceedings demur and say that Ike let Eden get away with permission to carry on more trade with Red countries such as China. Others say that the President simply passed the buck to Congress on this matter.

Congress, under the Battle Act, is empowered to crack down on those "free" and "friendly" powers who take our economic aid and then trade with the Red axis countries. Capitol Hill, it is believed, is in no mood to tolerate such goings on these days. In any case, observers say that "upcoming" in Senator McClellan's Committee on Executive Expenditures is exposure of a piece of British duplicity with the use of our money which can scarcely fail to inspire wrath in Congress.

The case is this — in rough outline — as relayed to us by inside sources. The U.S. loaned Britain many millions of dollars to build a railroad to and install equipment in a copper mine in Central Africa. After the enterprise was finally working and copper was extracted, several million dollars worth of the metal was sold by the British to Soviet Russia.

Letter from EDGAR W. HIESTAND, U.S. Representative, California: "I can thank HUMAN EVENTS and one other sound conservative publication for my being in Congress today. I received a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS when it was started, and have been a subscriber ever since. It has helped my thinking immeasurably. While there are many pressures, griefs and frustrations connected with this job, it is a source of great satisfaction to be in the spot where you can 'punch' and the 'punch' is a direct hit. My hat off to HUMAN EVENTS."

Government by Bureaucrats: This week, one of the top members of the Eisenhower administrative machine, Edmund F. Mansure, resigned his job as head of the important General Services Agency. He said he was getting out for "personal reasons." New Dealers have recently sought to smear Mansure, claiming that he used his influence to help business friends in his home town of Chicago. No one really believes this in Washington. The current judgment in the Capital — from those who have watched prominent business men like Mansure come in and go out of Government — is that Mansure was too weak in dealing with the New Deal holdover bureaucrats. Advised to clean house when he took office, Mansure ig-

nored this counsel and kept the old Democratic faces in office around him. Consequently, the hold-over bureaucrats ran the show and Mansure had to "take the rap" for alleged errors. It's a familiar story in the Eisenhower administration.

Hughes Trial Repercussions: This capital is more than mildly curious about the amazing lack of newspaper attention given to the testimony, in the Paul Hughes trial in New York, of Assistant United States Attorney Thomas A. Bolan, who had done most of the spade-work in preparation for Hughes' trial.

Called to the stand by the defense, after the trial had been under way for several days (a highly unusual step in itself), Bolan was asked if he had seen any discrepancies or inaccuracies in the testimony of government witnesses. Bolan replied in the affirmative, specifically mentioned Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the leftist *Washington Post and Times-Herald*; James A. Wechsler, editor of the equally-liberal *New York Post*; and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. Rauh was the ringleader of the frantic dealings with Hughes, who collected more than \$10,000 for a set of fabricated documents which, if genuine (as they were not), would have shown Senator Joseph R. McCarthy to have been engaging in various illegal and unethical practices — this in 1954, during the crucial days of the left-wing's violent campaign to "get" McCarthy. From Bolan's testimony, the trio obviously were having trouble keeping their stories coordinated to make it appear that they dealt with Hughes in the firm belief his documents were genuine and as a service to the public welfare.

Of the many newspapers which come to the attention of HUMAN EVENTS, the only mention found of Bolan's testimony was in the *Chicago Tribune*. A recapitulation story, after the jury had acquitted Hughes on two of the six counts in his indictment and reported themselves hopelessly deadlocked on the other four, said Bolan's testimony was regarded as one of the deciding factors in the jury's verdict.

It would be understandable, say Capital observers, that the two *Posts* would seek to brush the testimony under the rug and hope it would go unnoticed; the lack of attention to it from the scores

of patriotic, pro-American newspapers around the country, to say nothing of the supposedly impartial wire services, is more difficult to understand.

This question is asked here: What would the *New York Post* or the *Washington Post and Times Herald*, which sanctimoniously beat their breasts over such issues as alleged pre-judgment of the guilt of witnesses before Congressional Investigating Committees and purported violations of civil rights, have said if a conservative had been caught buying obviously-spurious documents from an unaccredited operator like Paul Hughes? Someone like HUMAN EVENTS, the *Chicago Tribune*, George Sokolsky, Westbrook Pegler, or Fulton Lewis, Jr.? You guess.

Electoral Reform: Reform of the electoral college is before the Senate and the hopes of many, who want to see ended the domination of the big-city states (like New York) over the naming of presidents, are on the rise. Several proposals of reform in recent years have given promise of abolishing the present "winner-take-all" system whereby a bare majority in say, New York, would award all of that state's 45 electoral votes to the bare winner. The two leading plans for electoral college reform are the Daniel-Kefauver and the Mundt-Coudert amendments. The first would leave each state the same number of electoral votes it has today but instead of "winner-take-all," the electoral total would be divided mathematically between the major party candidates in exact proportion to the popular vote. Instead of New York's 45 electoral votes — for example — going to a candidate carrying that state by 51 per cent, the candidate would get 51 per cent of the electoral votes, with other candidates getting their proportionate shares.

The second plan, the Mundt-Coudert amendment, would divide up the electoral vote in each state on the same basis as Senators and House members now are elected — that is, two presidential electors would be chosen at large, the rest by congressional districts. The Mundt-Coudert plan actually was the way electoral votes were cast in the early days of the Republic — before grasping politicians set up the "winner-take-all" system.

As it stands today, the Daniel-Kefauver plan probably has more support in the Senate than has the Mundt-Coudert plan; although the latter

enjoys more favor among press observers and students of the question. Consequently, one compromise has been suggested which at present Senators Daniel and Mundt are exploring: a combination of the two plans into a single amendment, leaving it to the individual states to decide by legislative enactment in which manner their electoral votes would be cast for presidential candidates.

ILO: Somewhat belatedly, the Board of Directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce finally has gotten around to adopting a stand on the question of this country's continued participation in the increasingly socialistic and welfare-statist International Labor Organization. But the action is far from the forthright withdrawal recommended by the U.S. Employer Delegate to the ILO, Cincinnati businessman W. L. McGrath, who was appointed some years ago to the position on recommendation of the Chamber. (His story was told in the HUMAN EVENTS issue of December 31, 1955.)

The C. of C. Board's resolution says the Chamber will participate again this year in nominating an employer delegate to the ILO, but then seeks to take the curse off this decision by recommending that Congress investigate the ILO's "activities and structure" with a view to "determine whether the United States should continue its support of and participation in this organization." It also recommends that the Executive branch "re-examine the activities" of the ILO.

Observers find it difficult to explain the reluctance of this organization to take a firm stand.

Bay State Jealousy: With the liberal-internationalist clique of Presidential intimates continuing its campaign to "dump" Vice President Richard M. Nixon in event Mr. Eisenhower decides to run again, a new name pops into speculation as a possible new number two man on the Republican ticket — Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts.

It comes as somewhat of a surprise, too, in view of the time and effort presently being put into a national build-up for the Bay State's GOP Governor, Christian Herter. That effort, however, is

aimed at trying to give Herter sufficient stature to qualify as top man on the ticket if Mr. Eisenhower decides "no." Whether he would be interested in the second spot is questionable, for a variety of reasons.

Reports are circulating that the lanky, quiet Senator's nose is figuratively badly out of joint because of the Herter build-up. When Henry Cabot Lodge lost his Senate seat in 1952, Saltonstall is reported to have concluded that he would automatically become top dog in Republican ranks in Massachusetts; now he finds himself relegated to a secondary position, behind Herter; reportedly, he does not like it.

Now 63, Saltonstall first was elected to the Senate in 1944 to serve out the unexpired term of Lodge, who had resigned to take up active Army duty; he has since been re-elected twice. He was Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee during the GOP controlled 83rd Congress. On his record as a liberal Republican and an internationalist, he undoubtedly would be acceptable philosophically to the Presidential intimates.

Book Front: The United States Information Agency has given its blessing to the formation of a "National Book Committee" which is to select books to be mass-printed for distribution abroad. The kind of books selected naturally depends upon the composition of the Committee. So, who turns out to be its executive secretary? Charles G. Bolte, a founder of the leftish American Veterans Committee, and a former editor of the left-wing *Nation*. This fact — among others — is brought out in an article "Ambassadors of Anti-Americanism," by Eugene Castle, in the February *American Mercury*.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for \$1.

Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$13 a year; airmail, \$18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index \$15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D.C. Copyright 1956.

Article Section

NUCLEAR NONSENSE

By DAVID SHEA TEEPLE

IT WOULD BE ridiculous to use a pile driver to set the pegs for a pup tent. Gold scissors will probably cut string but few people feel the need for them. You can light your cigarette with a paper match for free. If you desire, cigarette lighters are available from \$1.00 to several hundreds of dollars. For those to whom cost is no object it is possible that ten Ph.D.'s could hook up a solar device for a considerably larger sum to perform the same service. You pay your money and take your choice.

With these absurd parallels in mind shall we take a look at the atomic power boom? There are many questions to be answered and it is time that some were asked.

To firmly establish that we are not against scientific progress and that we do not wish to turn the clock backwards, let us list the major activities of the atomic energy program which we heartily endorse.

First, all phases of weapons superiority must be maintained regardless of cost.

Second, propulsion of military vehicles and missiles, either land, sea or air, should be developed without regard to cost.

Third, portable package reactors, power plants should be developed for use in areas

where conventional fuels are not available. In this area, cost is an item but not necessarily the controlling one.

Fourth, research and development programs in biology, medicine, agriculture and industrial applications should be pursued to the degree that competent advisors recommend. Cost in these programs is not a factor.

Fifth, experimentation to determine the feasibility of economic power production should be systematically continued by the Government at the reactor test sites located in remote areas which were originally purchased for that purpose. The cost of this program should be carefully evaluated, but lack of appropriations should not be allowed to in any way hamper a full and complete scientific investigation of the problem.

Now we can direct our examination to the single question, namely, the *economics and desirability of locating* large atomic central power stations in urban areas of the United States. Do we need nuclear power plants *now* or in the *foreseeable future* in the United States?

There are a host of arguments on either side. Let us assume that at the present time we do not need such plants but that perhaps, in the future, we will. This would

justify an experimental pilot type program as described above in item 5, but it could not support the present plans for *producing* plants.

IS THERE any evidence to support a reasonable expectation that atomic power will be economically competitive with our conventional fuels in the foreseeable future? Certainly not, if the true costs are shown for Government subsidies, research, capital investment and the purchase agreements for the plutonium which will be a by-product of an atomic power reactor.

For years the AEC has been telling the American people that the fissionable material contained in the weapons stockpile does not deteriorate and is like gold in the bank, which when peace comes, can be used for power purposes. Now, when there are those who are beginning to wonder whether we have made enough weapons, the AEC gives a guided tour through the Savannah River plant to a newspaperman and allows him to leak out the following statement:

"For it is incorrect to assume that once our country has a suitable 'stockpile' of atomic weapons we have a true and standing supply. ATOMIC BOMBS DETERIORATE IN STORAGE."

This is a dangerous statement, for it is not a question of *bombs*. It seems designed to deceive and to serve as a justification for an extension of the preposterous subsidies on *uranium ore*, which we anticipate the AEC will announce in the near future.

Are we depleting our conventional fuels in order to create a potential fuel which, in fact, we do not need? This is an intrigu-

ing thought. It takes electrical energy to mine uranium ore, ship it, smelt it, reduce it to oxides and then to metal. It also takes energy to fabricate same, put it in a metal jacket and ship it to the reactor site where it will be used to create energy. How much energy do we use in the process and how much will we get out after we have finished?

Certainly at the present time no one has ever published such computations. We do know that, according to expert testimony, the AEC now uses at least ten per cent of the total electrical output of the U.S. and expects to use fifteen per cent or more by 1965. Are we pouring bucketfuls of water to "prime" a pump from which we eventually may get only a trickle? What about the cost of storage of radioactive wastes and the separation of plutonium, reduction, refabricating and re-canning of used fuels before they can be re-cycled in a power reactor?

The late Admiral William S. Parson, atomic expert for the Navy, stated in 1948,

". . . Actually there are no known mountains of high-grade uranium oxide ore; in fact, in most cases the ore content is so low that the energy expended in extracting the ore more than offsets any nuclear energy from fission of the hard-won atoms."

Who is going to pay for all this and what is the ratio between these costs and the ultimate cost of the energy derived? Perhaps, if we spent one-tenth of the money in experimentation and development of more efficient methods of utilizing conventional fuels, we would be far ahead.

On October 10, 1955, W. K. Davis, Director, Division of Research and Development, AEC, stated that,

"Perhaps someone will learn to make electricity directly without going through the thermodynamic cycle. In theory, this might be done more readily with conventional fuels by 'carbon cell' than with nuclear fuel. I believe that success in the generation of electricity directly from the fuel material will depend upon a new invention which might apply to either fossil or nuclear fuel."

THE ABOVE considerations suggest that we are driving a nail with a *platinum* hammer. An elementary student of the power problem knows that low temperature heat is much cheaper than high temperature heat, but that also it is not as usable. In jets, we attain high temperatures which perform some astounding feats for us. Conversely, the tremendous quantities of low temperature heat, in a river below the condensor outlets of a steam plant, are worthless. In atomic fission we have the capability of creating heat measured in millions of degrees — our best steam plants can only use heat in the range of 12 to 1500°. The reactors which we contemplate probably will not reach quite that temperature, although if they ever got out of control, they might exceed it a thousand-fold.

We propose therefore to take this tremendous heat potential and downgrade it at very great cost to the point where it is usable. We propose to take this energy colossus and keep it harnessed and tied like Gulliver in the land of the Lilliputians. In some ways it seems like using the sun for a cigarette lighter.

Be that as it may, where are the benefits to be derived from this program? Do they go to the consumer? Will the people of Shippingsport, Pennsylvania (location of our largest power reactor now under construction) be able to procure their power at a substantially lower rate? The only evidence is the statement of the AEC that this reactor will not be economical and therefore presumably the cost of any power generated will be higher than that now available. The same thing will, of course, apply to industrial users.

Who profits by this reactor? The builder certainly makes money — the operator presumably gains technical competence and gets in on the ground floor if there is such.

Those who manufacture components and handle the financial transaction certainly gain. It has been shown that 80 per cent or more of the cost of electrical energy to the consumer occurs after the energy has been generated (transmission lines, labor, taxes, overhead, collection, etc.) so that even if atomic power could be produced for nothing, the householder with a \$6.00 per month power bill would still pay \$4.80. Just in case anyone expects such a reduction, however, let us quote Dr. W. Kenneth Davis, who stated in June, 1955,

"One of the most persistent erroneous ideas concerning nuclear power is that the fuel for nuclear power plants is of entirely negligible cost. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, one of the most difficult problems in the development of economic nuclear power is to get the cost of the fuel cycle down to an acceptable level."

Maybe we should read what the McKinsey and Company Consultants told the

Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy in July, 1955,

"Present technology for the production of electric power is based simply on atomic energy replacing fossil fuels as a source of heat, with the balance of the process for the production of electric power remaining the same. Under this technology, authorities do not now anticipate that the cost of electric power in the United States will be substantially lowered through the use of atomic energy as a fuel. This fact limits the extent of the impact on the economy of the United States, but has real significance for other economies where the costs of fossil fuels are substantially higher."

What's on the other side of the coin? Shall we talk about stack gas, the disposal of radioactive wastes, the possible dangers of a melt-down, or a natural or induced catastrophe which might release deadly contaminating material to the air, soil or water?

THE VAUDEVILLE TEAM is still on the road. People who should know better are astounding their gullible audiences with visions of a disease-free eternal life, and a veritable "greenhouse" civilization in which year around air-conditioned cities are to be created through the miracle of atomic power. Strange that with such great faith they did not propose the substitution of an atomic power plant for the gone-but-not-forgotten, Dixon-Yates, coal-fired, steam power plant proposal which so raised their blood pressure.

Generally, when we change techniques of manufacturing, it is because we achieve a better or a cheaper product. Are either

of these yardsticks applicable to the development of atomic power? The product is going to be the same — the hazards are going to be increased and the cost is going to remain constant or, if anything, increase.

Why then the hysterical rush to develop this program? What is wrong with pursuing the problem in an orderly scientific fashion, in isolated sites already established for that purpose?

Some of us have spent many an hour inside reactor buildings and know that every conceivable safety device is employed. The possibility of disaster is remote but *nevertheless ever present*. The old saying still applies to the effect that nothing can be made so "fool proof" that a big enough fool can't disrupt it.

You can take it from us, or ignore it if you prefer: We would rather continue to pay our present electric power bill than to live and raise our families in the shadow of an atomic reactor at the present and foreseeable stage of the art.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$20 per thousand.

David Shea Teeple is a former Assistant to Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He previously contributed to HUMAN EVENTS on July 30, 1955 — "Science, Secrecy and Security."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only:
6 weeks for \$1.